



A Declaration & plain-  
ner opening of certaine pointes,  
with a sound Confirmation of some  
other, contained in a trea-  
tise intituled,

*The Divine beginning and institu-  
tion of Christes true visible  
and Ministeriall  
Church.*



Written in a letter by the Author  
of the said Treatise out of the low  
Countreys to a friend of his  
in England.

The Letter is as followeth.

**M**Y deare and loving friend, as  
by your selfe, so by sundry other  
meanes besides I have ben con-  
sidered, that divers pointes & pas-  
sages of my late Treatise intituled, The  
Divine beginning and institution of  
Christes true Visible and Ministeriall  
Church, are doubtfully taken, that is, some  
of them are not well conceived, some misli-  
ked, by divers godly, wise, & well affected  
in England. Which thing verily could not

but be exceeding grievous unto me. so soone  
as it came unto my hearing. And it mooved  
me soorth-with seriously to bethinke my  
selfe how I might best doe, both to remeove  
the offence taken, and to cleare the truth  
contained in that Treatise from all preiu-  
dice and misconceit against it. For it being  
the duty of all modest and sincere hearted  
Christians, When any offence ariseth, to la-  
bour that no persons Whosoever should bee  
let alone in scandall, and neglected, if there  
may be remedy; how much rather ought I  
in conscience to reach out my hand to the  
godly and religious servantes of Christ,  
stumbling at something (as they thinke) by  
my selfe laid in the way, that they may bee  
holpen and held up from falling, which of-  
ten happeneth to many upon too light occa-  
sions. Although therefore it bee little ma-  
teriall what I write or speake, what I hold,  
or doe not holde: yet because even on so  
light an occasion as now is take, sometimes  
there may come sundry accidents which I  
would bee sory for, if they should come by  
my fault: for this cause I iudged it fit to  
employ my second thoughtes upon this busi-  
nes againe, for the clearing and plainer o-  
pening and also for the sound confirming  
of divers things in my said Treatise, which

as I beare have bene even by good men accepted against. Being desirous beerein to make manifest to all the world my great affection which I beare to give content to every honest and well disposed person, so farre as possibly I may or can with safetie unto the truth, which of all things in this earth is, and ought to be unto all men the most precions. What points therefore of exception have come to my notice, and are in any sort materiall, I have remembered beere in this letter unto you, and to each of them severally have adioyned an answer so plaine and so direct, and where need is, so firme, as I can make. Wherein my desire is (and I hope I shall not faile) to satisfie every indifferent and equally minded Christian, especially who knoweth the corruptions that are among vs, & who loveth the simplicitie of the truth, & not cōtention.

**F**I R S T therefore, whereas some have an imagination that I am one of the Separation, & am separated from all communion with the publike Congregations of England. To them my answer is, that touching this point they erre in their imagination. Although I know the Separation to be very farre off from being so evil as commonly they are held to be;

6.  
yet I deny not but that in some matters they are straiter then I wish they were. Howsoever, as to the point of Separation, for my part I never was, nor am separated from all publike communion with the Cōgregations of England. I acknowledge therefore that in England are true Visible Churches and Ministers (though accidentally, yet) such as I refuse not to communicate with. And so much for answer to this point shall suffice.

2.

Secondly, in the Treatise a doubt is made by some, what the meaning and intent is of the maine Proposition it selfe.

The wordes whereof are these, to wit,

*“ Christ is the only author, institutor, and fram-  
mer of his Visible and Ministeriall Church touch-  
ing the Nature and Forme thereof. ”*

I.

My answer heerevnto standeth on 4. pointes. First, that the Proposition it selfe in the generalitie of it (as the words ly) is true both of the Jewes Visible Church vnder the Lawe, and also of the Christian Church vnder the Gospell. Secondly, yet never-

2.

theless the proper meaning and intent of this proposition (as I apply it) is to signifie no more but Christes Visible Church vnder the Gospell, and that indefinitely and generally: I meane that Christ is, & ought to be beleevd to be the only Institutor of his true Visible Churches Nature and Forme vnder the Gospell, whether it be of this or of that, or whatsoever

par-



particular forme it be of; & that it ought to be beleevved to be of some certain particular forme. The wordes them selves of the Proposition do import the largenes of this sense; reason also requireth such generalitie in every Proposition where the wordes and circumstances will permit it, and the 31. Arguments (annexed for proofes) do serve therevnto directly. Thirdly, in speciall sort in the third and nienth Arguments, I proove that Christ is the only institutor of his true Visible Churches nature and forme vnder the Gospell definitely and determinately, that is in that very particular forme which the *Definition* there noteth, and is set downe further in the second *Explanation* there ensuing. That is, that such a Church is only one ordinarie Congregation governed with the peoples free consent. Where I graunt also that secundarilie, and by consequence from the said 3. and 9. Arguments, I intend to proove that point also in the rest of the 31. Arguments, even this very particular forme (heere last mentioned) of Christs visible Church. And I affirme that by consequence they all-doe sufficiently conclude the same. But it is only by consequence, as I said: it is not contained immediatly, expressly, or literally in those Arguments them selves. Fourthly, whatsoever other consequences also do followe from the fore-  
noted

3.

4.

noted pointes (wherein the maine Propositions intent and meaning is now by me declared) I deny not but this said Proposition doth include and import the same. Provided alwayes that these Consequents be necessarie, and such as do follow from the former pointes inevitably.

Which I am carefull to observe and note in this place, that the Reader may discernie and consider what that is which this Treatise doth mainly and principally defend, and what is only a dependant on it, and a cōsequent therefrom. Which in equitie is not of any person either violently to be strayned, nor curiously to be wrong and wreiled. But rather we ought to thinke of the maine matter, and remember who saith,

“ Luc. 21. 33.

† Ioh. 10. 35.

*Heaven and earth shall passe away, but my part of Christes word shall faile, nor alter. Also, The Scripture can not be broke, & namely, not in those places alleadged in the Treatise plētifully, wher this Kingly Office & right of Christ is taught vs.*

3.  
“ Trear. pag.  
1.2.

Besides this, Exception is taken at that a litle after, where I set downe, that “ *a Visible and Ministersall Church is a companie of people assembling for the exercise of religion, and administering among them selves the holy things of God, and particularly the whole Ecclesiasticall government, as occasion requirerth*. There may be a Church (some say) which administreth not the whole Ecclesiasticall government. I answer: In this place my pur-

purpose was only to distinguish between a Church *Invisible*, and *Visible* whiche I call likewise *Ministeriall*: and may also in another terme very fitly bee called a Church \* *Politicall*, that is indued with power of outward administratiō, though spirituall. My purpose heere was not to set downe any further exact description of a Visible Church about their administering the whole government. Howbeit touching this point also, I say, there is no Visible, Ministeriall, or Politicall Church, if it bee of Christ, but it hath power and right from him to administer even the whole Ecclesiasticall government, as well as any part. What Church soever hath right to one part of the Ecclesiasticall government, the same certainly hath power & right to the whole. Nevertheles I doubt not, a true Church may be abridged in the actual execution of the government, as also of some other of Gods ordinances; but not in the right and power to execute the wholly. Which still sufficeth to the being of a true Visible Church, and is convertible with it, as the Scholes doe speak. So this surely was the very intent & meaning of this word in this place, *the whole Ecclesiasticall government*: which, I hope, no man can iustly finde fault with.

Againe, exception is taken against this that I say, "*Christes true Ministers all Church is*"

*such*

A Church Visible, Ministeriall, and Politicall. I understand to be all one,

\* Ephc. 3. 10.

*The Affertion.*

*such as hath power over persons not of many ordinarie Congregations, but of one ordinarie Congregation only.* Indeed heere I professe that Christes true Ministeriall or Visible Church is but one ordinarie Congregation only, or consisteth of people belonging to no moe ordinarie Congregations but one only: and therefore that Christes true Ministerial or Visible Church is not any Diocesan or Provinciaall Church. Where my meaning is not, that all Christes true Visible Churches evermore containe (each of them) no moe people then do make only one Congregation. But I meane, that none consisteth of many ordinarie and constantly set Cōgregations: every one hath but one such Congregation only, although occasionally a Church may have in it many vncertain & chāgeable Meetings.

And so the point assuredly is most evident and plaine in the whole New Testament. The prooffe whereof is easie, short, and fully sufficient. Namely thus: *In Christes and the Apostles institution and practise, all Ministeriall Churches were but one ordinarie Congregation onely. Therefore it followeth necessarily that all Christes true Ministeriall Churches nowe still and for ever are so, and must be so: that is, each of them consisteth, and ought to consist of people belonging to no moe ordinarie Congregations, but to one*

A prooffe of  
the foresaid  
Assertion.

one onely.

And first for this Consequence, verily The Consequence proved. it is so cleare & inevitable, that nothing can be more. Namelie, if Christ and his Apostles in their institution and practise left no Diocesan or Provinciaall Church, but such as were each of them one ordinarie Congregation onely, then now still and for ever all Christes true Ministeriall Churches are each of them but one ordinarie Congregation only. This doubtles can not be denied. For it is vnlawfull to holde any forme of a Church now which was not then, or hath no patterne for it vnder the Apostles. The whole scope of the maine Treatise, & the 31. Arguments therein contained doe proove so much: which also I have shewed before in this *Declaration*, viz. in my answer to the second doubt, in the "second, third, and " pag 6. 7. fourth point of the answer.

If any reply, that to be but one ordinarie Congregation, or many, is no Substantiall or Essentiall difference in a Visible Church. And then this is a changeable condition therein, and may bee altered by the discretion of men, according to the diversities of times and places; and so a Visible and Ministerial Church may yet bee all one in nature and substance still, though that which was of olde but one ordinarie Congregation, bee now a Diocesan or Provinciaall Church. Heere I Obiect. Answer.  
denie

denie the first part of this obiection. It is a Substantiall difference in a Visible Church to be but one ordinarie Congregation, or many. Wherefore also it is evident that the Consequence of this obiection is naught. And note, that this obiection is the chiefest ground of all the error in our question about the being or not being of a true Visible, Ministeriall, and Politicall Church. Remember likewise, that still we vnderstand a Church Visible, Ministeriall, and Politicall to be all one, as I observed before in the "Answer to the third Exception. I say then, that to be but one ordinarie Congregation only, & to be Diocesan or Provinciaall, is a verie substantiall and essentiall difference in a Visible Church, or at least these divers estates are inseparably ioyned to the essentiall differences of Visible and Politicall Churches, which in effect is all one.

" pag. 9.

A Substantiall  
difference in  
Visible Churches.

Reason 1. But this needeth good prooffe for it.  
 „ Wherefore I make it manifest thus. That  
 „ Body politike which admitteth not the  
 „ peoples free consent in their ordinarie  
 „ government, differeth by a substantiall  
 „ and essentiall difference from a Body politike  
 „ which admitteth the same freedom.

A Visible Church Diocesan, or Provinciaall, or larger, is a Body politike, that  
 „ admitteth not the peoples free consent  
 „ in their ordinarie government; a Church  
 which

which is but one ordinarie Cōgregation, „  
is a Body politike that admitteth this „  
freedome, and can admit it well.

Therefore a Dioceſan and Provinciall „  
Church, & larger, differeth by a Subſtan- „  
tiall and Eſſentiall difference from a „  
Church which is but one ordinarie Con- „  
gregation.

The firſt Proposition is acknowledged  
of all men of vnderſtanding, generallie to  
be true. Yet the truth thereof is moſt e-  
vident in the ſpirituall (that is the Eccle-  
ſiaſtical) government, to which intent  
it is heere chiefly applied. It is alſo plain-  
lie ſhewed in the ſecond *Explanation*, pag.  
3. 4. 5. of the Treatiſe. And againe, I ſhall  
ſomething further declare it in my An-  
ſwer following to the 5. Exception.

The ſecond Proposition or *Minor* is ac-  
knowledged alſo even of our adverſaries:  
indeed it cannot bee denied of anie. For  
Dioceſan and Provinciall Churches have  
never admitted, nor doe admit the peo-  
ples free conſent in their ordinarie go-  
vernment, neither indeed can they ad-  
mit it orderly. It would be in them to  
troublesome, confuſed, and impoſſible.

Yea, where each ordinary Congregation  
giveth their free conſent in their own  
gouvernement, there certainly each Con-  
gregation is an intire and independent  
Body politike, and indued with power  
immediatly vnder, and from Chriſt, as e-  
very

very proper Church is, and ought to be. And so then there can not be any proper Diocesan or Provinciall Church, where such Congregations be: though perhaps there may be somewhere at somtimes such names vsed (even of Diocesan and Provinciall Churches) for other respects.

Wherefore this very one thing, namelie this freedome of the Christian people orderly & religiously practised in a church, maketh that the said Church of necessity must consist of persons belonging not to many ordinarie Congregations, and those meeting in farre remote places (as the state is of Diocesan and Provinciall Churches) but of persons belonging to one only ordinarie Congregation. And that such were in the New Testament, & since, and are now also in these dayes, it is more then manifest. Wherefore thus the conclusion is most certaine, that a Diocesan and Provinciall Church differeth by a Substantiall and Essentiall difference, from a Visible Church which is but one ordinarie Congregation only.

2. Another prooffe heereof is this: That
- „ Church which out of the very Nature &
  - „ Forme of the constitution thereof, maketh
  - „ Pluralitie-Men and Nonresidentes
  - „ lawfull & good Ministers of the Gospell,
  - „ yea which hath her chiefe and principall
  - „ Ministers such, the same differeth by a
  - „ Substantiall difference from that Church
- where-



where no Minister can be so.

The Diocesan Church, and Provincial, and larger, are Churches of that Nature. The chief and principall Pastors in these, have charge of soules of many ordinarie Congregations: also in such wise as that they neither doe, nor can yeeld their ordinarie personall presence to their people. And these surely are Pluralitie-men, and Nonresidents, in the time of the Gospell. Contrariwise, that Church which is onely one ordinarie Congregation, can not have any such Ministers.

Therefore the Diocesan Church, the Provinciall, and larger, doe differ by a Substantiall difference from that Church which is but one only ordinarie Congregation.

Thirdly, this is another reason for it. 3.

Where all proper Pastors and Bishops, and their Churches do injoye ( as the Apostles did among them selves ) *pari consortio & honoris & potestatis*, even all one and the same honor and power, and where likewise none doth exercise authoritie over other, nor dominion over the Lords inheritance, there is a Substantiall difference from those Churches where it is otherwise.

In the Churches which are each but one ordinarie Congregation, this equall honor and power is injoyed, and no Pastors do exercise authoritie over others, nor

*Cyp. de vna Eccl.*

„ nor dominion over the Lordes inheritance: but in Provinciaall and Dioceſan Churches it is otherwiſe. As experience ſheweth.

„ Therefore in Churches which are each  
 „ but one ordinarie Congregation, there is  
 „ a Subſtantiall difference from Provinciaall  
 „ and Dioceſan Churches.

4. Fourthly thus: In thoſe Churches  
 „ where everie Paſtor doth *ſimul* that  
 „ is, Teach and Governe, exerciſing both  
 „ the Keyes, and delivering wholly the  
 „ Lords appointed portiō of ſpiritual nour-  
 „ riſhment to his houſhold, there is a Sub-  
 „ ſtantiall difference from thoſe Churches  
 „ where the moſt of the Paſtors doe not ſo,  
 „ nor many doe ſo; but doe ſeparate that  
 „ which God hath ioyned together.

„ In the Churches which are each of the  
 „ but one ordinarie Congregation, everie  
 „ Paſtor doeth *ſimul* that is, Teach and  
 „ Governe, exerciſing both the Keyes, and  
 „ delivering wholly the Lords appointed  
 „ portion of Spirituall nourishment to his  
 „ houſhold: in the Provinciaall and Dioceſan  
 „ Churches the moſt of the Paſtors nei-  
 „ ther doe, nor may doe ſo. Yea not above  
 „ one of 200. or one of 5000. doth ſo, or  
 „ can doe ſo. Thus † Separating that which  
 „ God hath ioyned together.

„ Therefore in the Churches which are  
 „ each of them but one ordinarie Congre-  
 „ gation,, there is a ſubſtantiall difference  
 „ from

“*Lus. 12. 42.*

*Act. 20. 28.*

*Pet. 5. 3.*

*1. Tim. 5. 17.*

*1. Theſ. 5. 12.*

*Mat. 18. 17. &*

*16. 19.*

† *Math. 19. 6.*

from Diocesan Churches and Provincials  
all and larger.

Firstly, thus: That Visible and Politicall  
Church which hath her foundation in  
Christes Testament, and also hath sett  
boundes and limites there, differeth fund-  
amentally, and substantially, and Essen-  
tially from that Church, which neither  
hath set boundes and limites in Christes  
Testament, nor any foundation there.

A Church which is onely but one or-  
dinarie Congregation, hath her Founda-  
tion in Christes Testament, and also hath  
set bounds and limites there: a Diocesan  
or Provinciall Church, hath neither.

Therefore a Visible and Politicall  
Church which is only but one ordinarie  
Congregation, differeth fundamentally  
and substantially and essentially from a  
Diocesan or Provinciall Church.

The first Proposition or *Major* is certain,  
because touching *the Church*, \* no other  
foundation can any man lay but that which is laid,  
which is Iesus Christ. Also every Body poli-  
tike (namely the Spirituall) having  
bounds & limites set by God, must needs  
differ substantially from that which hath  
no set boundes at all, but is left at large to  
the will of men: Whereby it may soone  
become (as vsually it doth) to great and  
vnwiely. Such a false foundation of  
Christes Church D. Downname layeth, and  
such false boundes thereof: viz. the order

as D. Down-  
ame. Defens.  
Book. 1. pag.  
73. &c.

of *the Civill state*. I have proved it at large  
in the Treatise to be so.

The *Minor* is likewise very true: viz. A  
Visible and Politicall Church which is on-  
ly but one ordinarie Congregation hath  
her foundation in Christes Testament. It  
hath both preceptes and patternes for it  
there, as is shewed in the *Treatise* Arg. 3. &  
9. and in *Reas. for reform.* pag. 19. 20. 21. yea  
most directly in the proofes of our *Antes-  
sents* heere presently following, pag. 20, &c.  
Again this Church hath her set boundes  
and limites in Christes Testament, seeing  
there it is (namely) *Ecclesia*, that is not  
many ordinarie set Assemblies but onely

as Ibid. pag.  
43. 44. 50. &c.

one. D. Downame saith, "*a Church under the  
Apostles was a great City and all the Country ad-  
joyning*, as it hath ben since. But this is a no-  
torious fable. Never any in those times  
vnderstood the word *Ecclesia* to signifie  
many ordinary assemblies, yea in places  
far distant a sunder as a Diocess is: though  
now so signifieth, & did signifie about 300.  
yeares after Christ, whe they began some-  
time to meane thereby a Province, or a  
Diocesse. But we must rest our faith vpon  
the sincere speaking and doing of the A-  
postles, not vpon the equivocating words  
and declining actions of men, especially so  
late. Neither meane we by *boundes* and *li-  
mites* of the Visible Church any circuit of  
ground at all: and so neither the set com-  
passe of a *Parish*, as it is now reckoned with

Note.

vs: but we vnderstand only that all the persons thereof belonged to one ordinary Congregation, and not to many in those times. This limit, we say, is set and determined in the word *Ecclesia*, where it noteth a political Visible Church in the New Testament. Which also in a good sense may be called a *Parish*, we graunt.

And these things verily are Substanti-  
all and Essentiall pointes in the Churches  
which are each but one ordinary Congre-  
gation, distinguishing them essentially  
from Diocesan Churches and Provincial,  
and larger: or at least they are inseparably  
ioyned to the essence of them (as before I  
said) which is all one in effect, and cometh  
to the same issue in our question as if they  
were of the very essence of them. So that  
the generall prooffe alleadged before in the  
beginning of "this Answer, viz. *In Christe  
and the Apostles institution and practise all Visible  
Churches were each of them but one ordinarie Con-  
gregation.*"

¶ Pag. 100

*Therefore all Christes true Churches now still and  
for ever are so, and ought to be so.*

This reason, I say, is firme and good, and  
cannot be shaken; the Consequence is vn-  
deniable. Seeing without question all  
Churches both then and now had & have  
but one only essence and forme, and con-  
stitution. Though they are many in nom-  
ber, yet all are but one in nature, and es-  
sence, and forme. Which both is manifest

in reason, and may be proved also by that generall axiome in *Eph. 4. 4. 5.* *There is one Body* (that is, one Visible and Politicall Church; seeing the generalitie of the word may extend heerevnto) *one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme.* This *Body, Faith, and Baptisme* are each of them simply one in nature; many in number.

The Antecedent pag. 10, proved.

Yet nevertheles this our maine reason, & Consequence, is true but vpon Supposition only, that is, if the first part therof be true; viz. If in Christes & the Apostles institution and practise all Churches then were each of them but only one ordinarie Congregation. Now this many do flatlie denie; many do greatly doubt of it; and it is the chiefeest point in all our controversie. Wherefore I will heere bring some most cleere & invincible reasons to prove it, namely, that *In Christes and the Apostles institution and practise all Churches then were each of them but only one ordinarie Congregation.* For prooffe whereof I reason, first thus.

Prooffe. 1.

Every Visible Church which had the  
 „ peoples free consent in their ordinarie  
 „ government rightly appointed, the same  
 „ was only one ordinarie Congregation: it  
 „ was no Provinciaall nor Diocesane Church.

„ All Christes true Visible Churches mentioned in the New Testamēt had the peoples free consent in their ordinarie government rightly appointed.

„ Therefore all Christes true Visible Churches

Churches mentioned in the New Testa-  
ment were each of them only one ordina-  
rie Congregation: none of them was any  
Provinciall, nor Diocesan Church.

The first Proposition is made manifest  
a little "before. The second or *Minor* is "Pag. 13. 148  
proved at large in the *Treatise* Arg. 3. and  
9. as also in the *Reas. for reform.* pag. 45. 46.  
47. &c. Vnto which point we have a ge-  
nerall consent of all godly learned men: a  
number of whom are remembered by Mai-  
ster *Whetenhall*, in his *Discourse*: besides such  
as Maister *Cartwright* plentifully alleadgeth  
in his writings to this purpose. Brieflie, See the *Al*  
the Churches abroad at this day do gene- *testasson*  
rally acknowledge it, as also the Churches *&c.*  
in the Primitive times did by their prac-  
tise. Where I pray let it be noted, that we  
stand strictlie vpon no other free consent  
of the people but this, that *populo in suis mo-* Beza.  
*his obtrudatur*: Nothing may be imposed on  
the people against their will. Which Mai-  
ster *Beza* resolveth ought to bee everie  
where. *Epist.* 83. And vnder the Apostles  
he sheweth that it was so at the least. *An-*  
*notat.* in Act. 14. 23. & in 1. Tim. 5. 22.

Secondly I reason thus:

No Church in the Apostles times had 2. 2.  
nie Pastors Pluralistes and Nonresidents. „

All Provinciall and Diocesan Churches „  
have some Pastors Pluralistes and Nonre- „  
sidents.

Therefore no Provinciall or Diocesan „  
Chur- „

Churches were in the Apostles times.

The first Proposition is generally held as a Principle of sound doctrine by all that have the feare of God, and any love of the truth in their hearts. For otherwise *Pluralistes* and *Nonresidents* Pastors wilbe Apostolicall and lawfull, yea verily ordained & appointed by the Apostles. Howbeit yet iustly doth every good mā abhorre them, and worthily accounteth them detestable esteeming them (as in deed they are) contrarie to the rule of the Gospell, and to the salvation of mens soules. Namely in that they are true and manifest causes of ignorance in the people, and of their vnchristian dissolutnes of life. The *Minor* is to be vnderstood of a Diocesan or Provinciall Church properly so called, that is, where the people of the ordinarie Congregations have not that free cōsent in their governement which before I spake of, which is, at least, that nothing be vrge d vpon the by any *spirituall power* against their willes. Where the people of the Congregations have not this free power in themselves, but are absolutly vnder a Diocesan or Provinciall iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, there is that Diocesan or Provinciall Church which I signifie in the *Minor* proposition. All which Churches have *Bishops* correspondent & proportionable to their said iurisdiction. I say, they all have such correspondent and proportionable *Bishops*,

Dico utrumque esse prodigiosum flagitium &c.  
Calv. Institut.  
4. 1. 7.

or



or els in all true reason they may & should have. Now al such proper Diocesan & Provincial Bishops have a full Pastorall charge of soules of a great many (300. or 400. or many mo) distinct ordinarie Congregations. They them selves, and their defenders acknowledge this plainly. Also none of these doth nor can give his ordinarie personall presence to 1. or 3. of these said Congregations by any possible meanes.

D. Down. b. 2.  
pag. 67. &c.

And what els is a Nonresident and Pluralist vnder the Gospell but such a one? Again, if of necessitie every such Bishop be a Nonresident to 2. or 3. severall Congregations vnder him, then how much more is he a Nonresident & Pluralist in respect of all to which he is Pastor? Wherefore it remaineth cleere and certaine that every Diocesan Bishop (and the Provinciaall much more) can not but be in the time of the Gospell a huge Nonresident. Which also maketh the *Minor* both heere & before, pag. 15. to be true: wherevpon the conclusion followeth, viz. *No Provinciaall or Diocesan Church was in the Apostles dayes.*

A third prooffe is this.

Where no Churches are superior to other in power: also where no Pastors do, exercise authoritie over other, nor dominion over the Lords inheritance, there are no Provinciaall nor Diocesan Churches.

3.

In all the New Testament there are no

B 4 such

such Churches, nor such Pastors.

- „ Therefore in all the New Testament  
 „ there are no Provinciaall nor Diocesane  
 „ Churches: but consequently, all are Ordinary Congregations only.

The *Major* proposition is knowne by experience, and is without all question. The *Minor* is as cleere in the text as any thing can be. For no where can any such Superioritie & Dominion in spiritual affaires bee found throughout the whole New Testament. Besides, the same is found expressly forbidden in Luc. 22. 26. and 1. Pet. 5. 3. There was not any firme Diocesane authoritie till the *Councell of Nice*, then it began first to be appointed by “ Law.

“ Nic. Concil.  
 Can. 6.

Before I grant there was an *old custome* of respecting the Metropolitā Bishops mind in the Churches affaires of meaner places, specially in *Egypt*: but it was by a free and voluntary affection and inclining heereunto, it was arbitrarie, it was without power, it imported no necessitie of obedience till this time of the *Nicen* Council. So that then I grant a kinde of Diocesane Church began about 330. yeares after Christ. Howbeit yet this was farre from making a Diocesane or Provinciaall proper and perfite Church whereof heere wee speake. Which indeed so long as the Christian people in the Congregations retained their freedom to consent in their ordinarie government, had no place in the world.

world. Now, restraint heereof tooke not place till after the 4. Council of *Carthage*: for then the people had this their libertie, about the yeare 420. yea (as wee may iudge) till the great Council in *Trullo*, which † confirmed the forenamed Council of *Carthage*, about the yeare 682. So long therefore and longer wee may well thinke, this proper Diocesan Church was not erected, at least not generally; but the ordinarie Congregations were the proper Churches yet still. Of this more els where. Nevertheles by this we see that our *Minor* is certain.

“Can. 22.

† Can. 3.

A fourth prooffe is this.

4.

Where all Pastors do *poimamein*, that is, Teach and Rule, and where all Churches do exercise both the Keyes, and do wholly deliver the Lords appointed portiō of spirituall nourishment to his houshold, there is no Provinciaall nor Diocesan Church. In the whole New Testament all Pastors, and all Churches do so.

Therefore in the whole New Testament there is no Provinciaall nor Diocesan Church.

This *Major* is likewise evident in reason and experience, as the last before was. The *Minor* is cleere by these texts, Act. 20. 28. and 1. Pet. 5. 2. and 1. Tim. 5. 17. and 1. Thes. 5. 12. Math. 18. 17. and 16. 19. Luc. 12. 42. vnto which all other are conformable and correspondent. If any sticke at

*Math.*

*Matth. 18. 17.* (as perhaps some will) I referre him for satisfaction therein to the Treatise it selfe, Arg. 3.

5. Fifthly thus I prove it.

» If the most flourishing Church of *Corinth*  
 » in the Apostles times was in the whole  
 » but onely one ordinarie Congregation,  
 » then all other Churches at that time, and  
 » since, are each of them but only one ordinary Congregation.

» The most flourishing Church of *Corinth*  
 » in the Apostles times was in the whole  
 » but only one ordinarie Cōgregation. For  
 so the Apostle saith of it, 1. Cor. 14. 23.  
*When the whole Church is come together in one,  
 or into one place, &c.* The whole then made  
 but one Congregation. The like we may  
 note, Chap. 11. 20. 18. chap. 5. 4.

» Therefore all other Churches then in the  
 » Apostles times and since, are each of them  
 » but only one ordinarie Congregation.

The *Major* is certain, because all true Churches of Christ both then, and for ever, had and haue but one forme, nature, and constitution, as is " before shewed, and our adversaries do † graunt. To the *Minor*, it is idle to say (as some do) that those wordes, *the whole Church came together into one place*, are to be vnderstoode distributively of many severall ordinarie Congregations then belonging to the Church of *Corinth*. Nay; evidently these wordes are spoken touching all, and to all them

" Pag. 19. 30.

† D. Down.  
 Book. 2. pag.  
 42. 45.

them, to whom the Epistle is directed, & also in that very maner. But the Epistle is directed *to the Church of Corinth* in generall collectively, 1. Cor. 1. 2. Therefore those wordes are spoken to the whole *Corinthian* Church in generall collectively; & collectively the whole in generall did *come together in one place* at that time. Besides, our adversaries say that the division of Parishes and Dioceses "came in about the yeare of Christ 260. So that then in the Apostles dayes neither the *Corinthian* Church, nor any other, was a Dioce-  
 fan Church. Some further object 2. Cor. 1. 1. *To the Church at Corinth with all the Saints which are in Achaia.* As if here all the Saints which were in all *Achaia* made then but one Visible Church with that at *Corinth*; and so the *Corinthian* Church then was a Diocefan or Provinciall Church. But there is no shew of reason in the world for this. As well may they conclude from 1. Cor. 1. 2. *To the Church at Corinth Saints by calling, with all that call upon the name of our Lord Iesus Christ in every place, both their Lord and ours.* As well, I say, they may from hence conclude, that *all who called upon the name of Christ in every place* then made but one Visible Church with that at *Corinth*, and so the *Corinthian* Church then was a Vniversal Visible Church. Which how absurd it is, all men see. Yet this is altogether as good, & as likely a collectio, as the other.

My

Platina in  
P. Dionys.

My sixth reason is this.

6. If the Apostles, where they speake of  
 „ Christians set in outward order through  
 „ a Province, do never mention any one ge-  
 „ nerall Church of that Province, or of a  
 „ Diocese, but alwayes many severall Churches,  
 „ such as were each of them one ordi-  
 „ narie Congregation only, then in the A-  
 „ postles times there was no Provinciaall or  
 „ Diocesan Church, but only such as were  
 „ each of them one ordinary Congregation  
 „ only. This sentence can not be denied or  
 „ doubted of: Seeing it is both presumptuous  
 „ & absurd to hold that there was such  
 „ a forme of a Church then as cannot bee  
 „ gathered out of any of their writings.  
 „ Againe, it is no lesse absurd, yea impious  
 „ to hold any such forme of a Church now  
 „ as was not then, or hath no patterne for  
 „ it vnder the Apostles. But indeed al that  
 „ former clause is most true: Where the  
 „ Apostles speake of Christians set in out-  
 „ ward Order through a Province, greater  
 „ or lesser, they never mention any one ge-  
 „ nerall Church of the Province, but al-  
 „ wayes many severall Churches. As is to  
 „ be seene by their naming plurally *“the*  
 „ *Churches of Galatia*: never one singular  
 „ Church of *Galatia*. Likewise plurally *“the*  
 „ *Churches of Iudaea*: & *“of Macedonia*: & *“of Asia*,  
 „ &c. Never finde we one Church general in  
 „ any of these Provinces: neither can the like  
 „ be found any where in all the New Testam.

\*1. Cor. 16. 1

Gal. 1. 2. & 21

\*Vers. 21. &

1. Thes 2. 14.

\* 1. Cor. 8. 1

7 1. Cor. 16.

19.

More

Moreover the several Churches thus plu-  
rally named, are such as were each of  
them singularly one ordinary Congrega-  
tion only. The word it self importeth it. T Ecclesia.

Therefore then in the Apostles times  
there was no Provinciaall or Diocesan  
Church, but onely such as were each of  
them one ordinarie Congregation only.  
And so D. Dodwames dissolute ground of a  
Church, viz. that it may follow the order  
of the civil State is heereby also quite over-  
throwne.

Against the Minor they object, that there  
was a generall Church of Crete, whereof  
Titus was Bishop. I answer, the New Tes-  
tament no where nameth one generall  
Church of Crete, nor Titus Bishop of Crete.  
Therefore heere is nothing against vs  
Eusebius speaking of these times, "nameth  
the Churches of Crete plurally. Neither could  
Titus be any proper Bishop of Crete, for he  
was in the same Function and Office of  
Ministerie before he came to Crete, as he  
was when (for a time) he taried there. But  
before, being at <sup>at</sup> Jerusalem, at <sup>at</sup> Corinth, in  
<sup>at</sup> Macedonia, he was the no proper Bishop:  
he was an Evangelist. Therefore hee was  
so in Crete also. Again he was as Timothy  
was. But the Apostle saith, he was <sup>an</sup> E-  
vangelist: neither is there any reason that  
the Apostle here spake improperly. Ther-  
fore Timothy and Titus both were Evange-  
listes: and by consequence not proper Bi-  
shops.

D Down. b.  
4. pag 87.

\* Euseb. 3. 4.  
and 4. 22.

" Gal. 2. 1.  
\* 2. Cor. 8. 17.  
† 2. Cor. 12.  
18 with 9. 2. 8

" 2. Tim. 4. 5.

shops, The workes of Bishops they did, & more too; as also the Apostles did. Who yet were no proper Bishops, neither could be: seeing the H. Ghost had made them

1. Cor. 12.

28.

Eph. 4. 11.

“ divers. Also the Bishoplike power which these all had, was in them materially, not formally, as I may so speake. And it is still to remaine with their Successors, not in the forme of their proper functions, viz. as they were Apostles or Evangelistes, but in an other forme, viz. in the ordinary Bishops and Pastors, who all indeed do equally succede them. And thus any thing that is objected of worth concerning *Titus* or *Crete*, is cleerely refuted. Further it is “ objected, that the

“ D. Down.

b. 2. pag 104.

“ Rom. 16. 2.

*Church of Cenchreas* as a *Parish* subordinate to the *Church of Corinth*. But this is easily proved to be false. *Paul* calleth it a *Church* properly, he speaketh heere questionles properly, and not by the figure *Synecdoche*, as signifying a part of a church, & not a whole Church. There is no cause of *Paul*es figurative speaking in this place: Therefore he did not so speake. But certainly he calleth this Church of *Cenchreas* by this name as properly, as he nameth the Church of *Corinth*, or *Ephesus*, or *Antioch*. And therefore certainly it was then as proper a Church, as intire, as totall, and independent, as any of them. Lastly those “ many 20. thousands at *Ierusalem* are objected, as making that Church then not one ordinary Con-

“ A. 21. 20.

“ D. Down.

b. 2. pag 91.

grega-



gregation only, but *Provinciall* at least. I answer, these were not all of the Church of *Ierusalem*. Heere in this text there is no such thing spoken, nor meant. But the solemne feast of *Pentecost* now being at *Ierusalem*, the greatest part of these men were come v<sup>p</sup> thither out of forraigne places and farre countries, as the Law required. For these were all Jews, *†* *Zealous of the Law*, as the text heere sheweth. And this "*multitudo*" (it is like) were they that would come together to know the truth of Paul when they should heare that he also was come thither. These therefore were not members of *Ierusalem* Church, though they were so many in that Citie at this time: neither doth this shew any thing of the greatnes or smallnes of the ordinarie Church at *Ierusalem* in those times, vnles it prove the same then to be, no more then one Congregation, seeing heere it is said of the whole multitude, that they would come together. Lastly thus I reason further: Every company of people ioyned together in a politic and signified by the *Greeke* word *Ecclesia* in the Apostles dayes, is but one ordinarie Congregation only.

All Christes true Visible Churches in the New Testam. are each of them a companie of people ioyned together in a politic and signified by the *Greeke* worde *Ecclesia* in the Apostles dayes.

There-

ACT. 30. 16.

† ACT. 21. 20.

" ROM. 20.

7.

22

22

22

22

22

22

22

32.

„ Therefore all Christes true Visible  
„ churches in the New Testament are each  
„ of them but one ordinarie Congregation  
only.

Every part of this reason is most manifestly true and certain.

D. Downam's whole resistance in his *Defense* standeth on a most frivolous & false exception against the *Major*. Saith he "The *circuit of a Church by the Apostles intention was the same before Parisbes (in a Diocese) were divided, as it was afterward.* Which all, who vnderstand the propertie of the *\*Greeke* word, do know to bee false. For all authentike *Greeke* authors do shew that *Ecclesia* with them signified that which in Latin is *Concilio populi*: that is, one particular assembly of people, and in respect as they are assembled together in one place: but never in those times did it signifie a multitude dispersedly coming together in many distinct ordinarie Meetings, and in farre remote places, as *Provinciall* and *Diocesan Churches* do. Now the Apostles spake as all authentike *Grecians* spake, & namely as they commonly vsed to speak in those times. So that, vnles the Apostles words in their knowe proper sense, and their intention be contrarie (which to imagine is to absurd) there is no truth in the *Dofers* saying. His whole discourse beside, being fraught with disdainfull & disgracefull reproches, such as become rather

" D. Down,  
b. 2. pag 49.  
34. 55 65.  
73.

\* Ecclesia.

Zuingl. Artic.  
2. Explanat.

rather a persecuter, then a Christian teacher of the truth, it deserveth wholly to be neglected, & passed over with silence. But because hee seemeth to him selfe to be somebody, it will not be amisse if his windy and wordy writing bee answered in a severall proper place. Which busines I commit to the providence of God. As for the point of the controversy heere in hande, that which I defend in this place, is easie to be further proved and declared by other reasons also: but for this time I will rest content with these Seaven before delivered, beside that which "heerebefore I have alleadged to this purpose.

" Reas. for reform. pag. 19.  
20.

The substance of all this whole matter is knit vp in this one argument following.

*No Visible Church of Divine Institution in the New Testament is Provinciall or Diocesan.*

*Every true Visible Church of Christ is of Divine institution in the New Testament.*

*Therefore no true Visible Church of Christ is Provinciall or Diocesan.*

The Major is proved pag. 20. 21. &c. The Minor is proved pag. 10. 11. 12. &c. Wherefore the Conclusion remaineth sure.

Further, some thinke that I set downe a Contrarietie where I say, "the Single and Compound formes of government differ the one from the other by a Specificall & Essentiall difference: and "the one ceaseth necessarily when the other cometh in place. And yet (as they imagine)

6.  
" Tractat.  
Page. 3.

" Page 4.

Pag. 6.

Imagine) contrarie to this I say, *That the Church government is mixt.* Howbeit nevertheless, indeed these sentences do stand together & agree right well. For the divers kinds of government (as the Diocesan, and Parochiall, that is, of onely one ordinarie Congregation; also the Monarchie, Aristocratie, and Democratic) may bee mixt *in gradu remisso* in their state remisse and abated, but not *in intenso gradu* in their perfect state: they may coioyne in their Accidents, but not Essentially, or in their distinct pure Essences. As the Direction of a Pastor, with the assistance of the Elders, and the peoples free consent in a Church may concur and stand together: thus may the government be mixed. But the peoples free consent cannot admit either a Diocesan nor yet Parochiall pure Monarchie, or absolute Aristocratie, thus they cannot be mixed. The one of these necessarily doth cease when the other cometh in place: and these are those formes of government of which I say heere, *they differ truly the one from the other by a specificall & essentiall difference.* If any sticke in the Epistle, where the Visible Churches Forme is said to be "*the power of a Single and Uncompounded spirital poltie.*" Let him consider that the reference there noted expressly sendeth him to the second *Explanation* in the beginning of the Treatise, where (pag. 5.) it is declared that it ought to be *with the people*

or Epist. pag.  
5. 12.

*peoples free consent*. Now in this the Forme is compleat and cleere. Howbeit yet wee speake not heere so exactly and curiously of the Visible Churches Forme; but that our meaning is only that it doth *convenire Subiecto omni, soli, & semper*: that it is convertible with it, and inseparable from it, and nothing els. And that this is in deed so proper to the said Church, it is proved in this same Treatise, Argu. 3. and 9. as before is noted. And in the *Reasons* for reformation, "pag. 45, 46, 47, &c. Now hence also it cometh, that where the Peoples free consent is orderly and constantlie had, there the Church can not bee but "only one ordinarie Congregation, and the government is Single, or over one Congregation only. Where the absolute government is. Diocesane or larger, there that Church can not possibly be one ordinarie Congregation only, nor can use ordinarily the Peoples free consent: but it must of necessitie be either by one person alone, or by a few choise persons absolut vnder Christ over a whole Diocese, or further. So that it is plaine enough divers wayes, that these governments are indeed (as I said) essentially distinguished: and the fore-rehearsed sentences do well stand together, and agree easily.

Moreover the first *Proposition* of the first Argument is thought by some to be amisse:

viz. "Whatsoever [is] a Divine institution, the

" Compared with pag. 26, 27. 28.

" As in Arg. 9. in the Treat. & above pag. 13. 14.

6.

" Treat. pa. 9.

C 2

same

*same is perpetuall.* But why should any doubt of this? They say, Because the Iewes high Priesthood was a Divine institution, also the Calling of the Apostles; and yet neither is perpetuall. Wherevnto the answer is easie: viz. Neither of these cometh near the point in question. The wordes of the Proposition are, *Whatsoever is:* not, *Whatsoever was,* or hath ben *a Divine institution.* Wherefore I speake of Divine institutions and ordināces which are now such at this present time, even in our dayes: not of such as were Divine heeretofore only, that is only in the time of the Iewes estate, or of the Apostles, such as the instances are which be objected. I speake not (I say) of any Leviticall or Apostolicall temporarie ordinances. Which to be my very meaning in this place, appeareth partly in the *Minor* Proposition of the said Argument, which of necessitie must be taken so; and more fully straight after in handling the prooffe of the said *Minor*.

7.  
Treat.  
“ Pag. 36.

“ Psal. 36, 26.

Further it is excepted against, where I say, “This word *Ecclesia* or *Kahal* in Hebrew is no where found in any Author (one or other) to signifie a bench of Iusticers, or Senat of Magistrates. This cannot be shewed in any other place at all. But contrarie to this some alleadge that the *Septuagint* do translate *Kahal* in “one place *συνδριον* a Senat. I answer, it is not materiall to our maine purpose in this place how the Hebrew *Kahal* is once by the *Sep-*

*Septuagint* translated, though I added this word, which I needed not. For all the matter indeed stādeth in the Greek word *Ecclesia*, which is the "originall text. Now concerning this word, there is no exception at all taken against that which heere I alleadge. No man findeth in any author (one or other) this word *Ecclesia* to signifie a Bench of Iusticers or Senate of Magistrates: no, not once. As for that Hebrew word *Kahal* also, seeing (for ought that appeareth) it is translated *Senat* no where, but only this once: we are to suppose that the same Authors (viz. the *Septuagint*) who translate it more then 100. times otherwise, do thinke the proper sense of this word not to be a *Senat*. And why it should not also be proper in the Hebrew translation of *Math. 18. 17.* there is no reason in the world. Againe the *Septuagint* them selves are of no good authoritie for translation. And learned men do iudge that (after the five bookes of *Moses*) the translation bearing their name, is not theirs. How so ever, they are generally knowen for translation to be most wide, strange, and vnfit. Maister *Hugh Broughton* "saith of them, that all learned men for these 1300. yeares space do know the *Septuagint* translators have infinite millions of faulses. Neither do our *English* translations, nor *Tremellius*, nor *Vatablus*, nor the *Interlinearie*, nor *Arias Montanus*, nor *Munster*, nor any good

"*Math. 18. 17*

D. Field. of  
the Church.

"Against Dav.  
Farrar thelew.

et Vix. Neither  
French, nor  
Dutch, nor  
Spanish, nor  
Italian.

Translators (as far as I know) follow the  
in this place of the *Proverbes*. So that name-  
lie here they seeme to be held of no sound  
writer, for Authors of any credit in this  
particular, howsoever they bee esteemed  
otherwise.

8. Againe, some mislike that (in the *As-  
sumption* of Argument 7.) the Ministeriall  
Church and Church-governement are  
said to be *Fundamentall* *pointes of religion*, and  
*a part of the foundation of Christian faith*. But if  
men would consider things well, sure  
heere is no cause of mislike. Alwayes re-  
membring, that I do not take *the foundation  
of faith* heere in that sense as Christ him-  
selfe is held and acknowledged to bee the  
Foundation of our faith, 1. Cor. 3. 11. He  
alone is that absolute Foundation. Nei-  
ther do I take it in that sense as the word  
of God is acknowledged to be the general  
foundatiō of faith, which only together  
with Christ (the author of it) our faith  
can rest on. But in that sense I take it as  
the Apostle vseth it in *Hebr.* 6. 1. 2. where  
manifestly he vseth this word *Foundation*  
to signifie certaine points of religion, and  
speciall Doctrines necessary to salvation  
ordinarily, and vchangeable by men.  
He setteth downe in this place 6. of them:  
of which some are Inward, some Out-  
ward: Some requiring outward action &  
practise, some speculation and beliefe on-  
ly. Among them that require outward  
action



action and practise, he nameth *Laying on of hands* as one part of this foundation. Now this cannot be heere vnderstood with any good colour, but for *Calling to the Ministerie*; as is shewed evidently in the Treatise. And Calling to the Ministerie, or the Making of Ministers is one maine part of Church-governement. And of that nature as the Church-governement is, of the same is the Visible, or Ministeriall, or Politicall Church it selfe. As also, of that nature as a maine part of Church-governement is, of the same is the whole. Wherevpon I reason thus: If "*Laying on of hands*" (which is one maine part of Church-governement, as before is shewed) be of the foundation, necessarie to salvation ordinarily, and vchangeable by men, the Church-governement, and the Church it selfe is so. But the former is certain by the text *Heb. 6. 2.* as before I have shewed. Therefore the later is certain also, viz. the Ministeriall Church & Church-governement are of the foundation of faith, or fundamentall pointes of religion, they are necessarie to salvation ordinarily, and vchangeable by men. Secondly, as *Baptisme* is heere called also *fundamentall*, so is this *Laying on of hands*, or *Calling to the Ministerie*. But heerein is meant no more (touching Baptisme) save that it is a meanes to salvation necessarie ordinarily, and simply vchangeable by men. Wherefore

## Reason

1.

"That is, *Making of Ministers* ordinarily effected by *laying on of hands*."

2.

3.

ſ<sup>r</sup> Cypr. de vai-  
tat. eccles.

even ſo is Calling to the Miniſterie vnderſtood to be, where in the Treatiſe it is called *Fundamentall*. Thirdly, I take it, no well adviſed Chriſtian will deny Chriſtes true Viſible and Miniſterial Church to be fundamentall. Of which, *Cyprians* ſaying is approved by all men, viz. *Deum non habet Patrem, qui Eccleſiam non habet matrem*: Hee hath not God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his mother. And like- wiſe is that cōmon ſaying; *Extra Eccleſiam non eſt ſalus*: Out of the Church there is no ſalvation. Both which ſayings are true of Chriſtes Viſible and Miniſteriall Church: howbeit not ſimply, but ordinariſie. Yea they ſignifie alſo, that this ordinarie way and meanes to ſalvation, (viz. the Viſible Church) appointed by God is vnchangeable by men. This ſenſe of *foundation* is givē to Chriſtes true Viſible Church, I ſuppoſe by all well adviſed Chriſtians.

4.

Fourthly, that is a fundamentall point which toucheth Chriſt (the abſolute ſou- dation) in ſome of his maine Offices immediatly, or (at leaſt) by a ſure and plaine cōſequence. But Chriſtes Viſible Church and governemēt doth immediatly touch him in his *Kingly* Office and in his *Propheticall* Office alſo. As is ſhewed at full in *Arg. 3.* in the Treatiſe; yea in every *Argument* there by a moſt certain Cōſequence. Moſt direclty in the 4. 6. 10. 17. 18. 19. 23. 24. 25. 26. 28. 30. 31. And in *Reas. for reform.*

pag.

pag. 52. 53. 54. Wherefore Christes Visible Church and Governement are to bee acknowledged *fundamentall* pointes in religion. Fiftly, let vs heere consider how we do iudge of the *Papistes* touching this matter, viz. touching Fundamentall errors. We all holde (and iustly) that certain Popish errors are Fundamentall, and against every one of Christes maine Offices. Among which, their error about the Visible Church and governement thereof is against Christes Kingdome. Wherefore hence it followeth that Christes Visible Church and Governement is a fundamentall point in religion: seeing their error which they holde in that matter is a fundamentall error, as wee all acknowledge. Sixtly, the learned writers "do set downe three Essentiall (at least, perpetuall: and necessarie) notes of a Visible Church, viz. *the Word, Sacraments, and Governement*. Vnderstand, that by this heere is meant *the power* to administer these things, as I have noted before pa. 7. Now if Governement thus be Essentiall to the Church, it may be also called fundamentall without question.

Where still I desire it may bee remembered, that by this our interpretation of *Laying on of handes in Hebr. 6. 2. to be fundamentall*, our whole meaning and intent is to shewe this only, that the Nature of Christes Visible Church and Governement is

vn-

5.

6.

Beza confess

5. 7.

P. Mart. in 1.

Cor. 1. 2.

Viret Dial. 14.

&amp; 21. at the end.

T. C. Reply 2.

pag. 53.

D. Field of the Church. 2. 6.

D. Down. Def.

b. 2. pag. 6.

The Confess. of faith in the end of the book of com. prayer.

vnchangeable by men : and that after the constant & perpetuall ordinance of God, salvation through Christ cometh vnto vs ordinarily alwayes by meanes of this true Visible Church & Ministerie of the word therein. According to that, "*Faith is by hearing, and hearing by the preaching of Gods word by Ministers orderly sent* (that is) according to his rule. Which doctrine all sound Divines do teach in like sort.

Heerevnto I will adde Mai. Cartwrights iudgement, who maintaineth this earnestly, that "*Masters of Discipline and kinde of Governements are matters necessarie to salvation, and of faith.*"

\* T.C. repl. 2.  
pag. 26.

If any doubt whether I think a mā may bee saved that erreth about the Visible Churches particular forme and Government. I answere, I thinke such a man may be saved. In what regard, and how, I have formerly set downe in those *Reasons for reformation*. pag. 55.

Lastly, the *Argument* 16. in the Treatise is excepted against. Where indeed I deny not, but the maner of gathering that *Argument* is scarce as it should be : the Enumeration there vsed might be somewhat more full. Howbeit that text of Scripture 1. Cor. 15. 24. (which is the ground of the *Argument*) will very well yeeld the Conclusion, so that it bee gathered and framed in such maner as now heere it is set downe. Wherefore I pray the Reader

to conceive it thus:

Where Christes whole *Oeconomieall King-*  
*dome* is signified, there also the Outward  
 Ecclesiastical administration & governe-  
 ment, or the State of the Visible Church  
 is indefinitely & generally signified. And  
 againe, it followeth from hence that also  
 there in the same text the Outward Ec-  
 clestiastical Government and State of the  
 Visible Church vnder the Gospell in spe-  
 ciall is signified. And withall there is sig-  
 nified that this same Outward Ecclesiasti-  
 call Government and State of the Visi-  
 ble Church vnder the Gospell is truly &  
 in deed Christes Kingdome. And like-  
 wise, that hee him selfe is the only Au-  
 thor, and Frammer, yea the only Lord,  
 King, and Law-giver thereof to the  
 worldes end. For who can be Author and  
 Law-giver of his owne kingdom but on-  
 ly him selfe?

In 1. Cor. 15. 24. Christes whole *Oecono-*  
*micall Kingdome* is signified.

Therefore in 1. Cor. 15. 24. the Outward  
 Ecclesiastical administration & governe-  
 ment, or the State of the Visible Church  
 (yea that vnder the Gospell) is also signi-  
 fied. And againe from 1. Corinth. 15. 24. in  
 such respect it followeth necessarily, that  
 the Outward Ecclesiastical Government  
 and State of the Visible Church vnder the  
 Gospell is truly and in deed *Christes King-*  
*dome*. And likewise, that hee him selfe is  
 the

Argu. 16. in  
 the Treatise.

the only Author, and Framers, yea the only Lord, King, and Law-giver thereof to the worldes end.

The Assumption heere is most evidently true. Considering that by Christes *Oeconomicall Kingdome* we meane (and so the Interpreters do call it and vnderstand it to be) all that power and rule which as Mediator and Head of his Church he received "of the Father, and administred ever since (by him selfe and his servants) till the worldes end, but no longer. Thus sense the present text (1. Cor. 15. 24.) will well beare being taken in the largest manner that the Circumstances do admit. And every text alwayes must be taken in such most large sense.

The Consequence of the Proposition standeth on foure partes. And I see not how any one of them can possibly be denied. If any should, it will easily be proved.

Thus, though our former *Argument* 16. in the Treatise for the manner of gathering, bee not (I grant) altogether so well as it should bee, yet the Text it selfe 1. Cor. 15. 24. doth still affoorde a good and sound Argument for our maine purpose, as is said. And thus in effect heere is nothing lost. And so much for answer to these 9. Exceptions.

*Hitherto*

*Hitherto (my deare and loving friend)  
 I have waded labouring to give satisfacti-  
 on to all good people (according as it may  
 come to their notice) so farre as my consci-  
 ence with warrant of the truth will permit.  
 Humbly desiring all loving and upright  
 harted Christians to interpret this same,  
 togeather with what soever I have heere-  
 tofore written, as only and meere the ef-  
 fectes of cōscience in me, agreeing (so neare  
 as I could discerne) to my dutie inioyned  
 me in Gods word. The grace, mercy, and  
 love of God in Iesus Christ be with vs all.  
 Amen. Middleborough. the 4. of Sep-  
 tember. Anno 1611.*

HENRY IACOB.

